

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. Currently, claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 13-14, 17, and 19-20 has been amended. Claim 4 and 15 have been cancelled. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-3, 5-14, and 16-20 will be pending, of which claims 1, 13, and 20 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 1-3, 5-14, and 16-20 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections to the extent maintained over the amended claims and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to claim 2 for informalities. This claim has been amended to address the Examiner's comments. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claim 2.

SPECIFICATION OBJECTION

The Examiner objected to the specification, stating that the Applicants failed to provide antecedent basis for the claimed terminology "computer usable medium" in pending claim 20. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the terminology "computer usable medium" to mean any type of storage medium capable of being read by a computer. The Specification of the present application provides description discussing the implementation of an isolation environment comprising an application isolation layer and a user isolation layer (*see e.g.* Specification, paras. [0065]-[0080]). Additionally, the Specification discusses the ability to launch applications within isolation scopes regardless of where the application is installed to mitigate application compatibility and sociability issues without requiring a separate installation of the application within the isolation scope (*see* Specification, para. [0083]). One of ordinary skill in the art would understand the Specification to mean that the present invention requires having computer readable program code on a computing device, most commonly stored on some type of computer usable medium, in order for the invention to execute properly. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this objection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101**I. Claim 20 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that claim 20 is directed towards patent eligible subject matter.

Under the “machine-or-transformation” test of *In Re Bilski* (“Bilski”), claimed subject matter is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §101 if “(1) it is tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) it transforms a particular article into a different state or thing.” 545 F.3d 943, 954 (CAFC, 2008). Claim 20 recites an apparatus comprising computer usable medium having computer readable program code means for presenting an aggregate view of native resources. These means-plus-function limitations include corresponding structure defined in the Specification. Such an apparatus having these means is a particular machine and is thus statutory subject matter (see MPEP 2106.01, citing to *In Re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 1360-1361 (Fed. Cir. 1994)).

Because claim 20 is directed to a particular machine, Applicants submit that claim 20 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §101. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 20 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103**II. Claims 1-20 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,162,724 to Blaser et al. (“Blaser”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,203,696 to Atm (“Atm”). Claims 1, 13, and 20 are independent. Claims 4 and 16 have been cancelled, thereby mooting the rejection with respect to these claims. Claims 2-3, 5-12 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claim 14-15 and 17-19 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 13. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims, to the extent maintained over the claims as amended, and submit that Blaser and Atm, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

A. Independent Claims 1, 13, and 20 Patentable over Blaser and Atm

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Amended claims 1, 13, and 20 are directed towards a method, a system, and an article of manufacture, respectively, for presenting an aggregate view of native resources. As amended, the claims recite an isolation environment comprising a user isolation layer and an application isolation layer. The claims further recite enumerating a plurality of system-scoped native resources provided by a system layer and enumerating, by the isolation environment, a plurality of application-scoped native resources provided by an application isolation layer. After determining that an application-scoped resource corresponding to a system-scoped resource exists, the application-scoped resource replaces the system-scoped resource in an aggregate view of native resources. After determining that a user-scoped resource corresponding to the application-scoped resource exists, the user-scoped resource replaces the application-scoped resource in the aggregate view of the native resources. Applicants respectfully submit that Blaser and Atm, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Blaser fails to teach or suggest an isolation environment comprising a user isolation layer and an application isolation layer. Blaser also fails to teach or suggest determining that a user-scoped resource corresponding to the application-scoped resource exists and replacing the application-scoped resource in the aggregate view of the native resources. Blaser describes application layers which are isolated from other application layers on a computer (*see* col. 3, lines 41-45). Blaser specifically bundles user files into the same layer as the application to provide a package that may be compressed or encrypted and transported conveniently (*see* col. 7, lines 15-18). Thus, Blaser does not teach an isolation environment comprising a user isolation layer and application isolation layer because Blaser fails describe user isolation layers. Although Blaser describes having multiple application layers, the application layers are isolated from each other and only provide a view of an application layer and the base layer, rather than the multiple application layers and the base layer. Blaser also does not teach determining that a user-scoped resource corresponding to the application-scoped resource exists. Therefore, Blaser fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Similarly, Atm also does not teach or suggest an isolation environment comprising a user isolation layer or an application layer, nor does Atm teach or suggest determining that a user-

scoped resource corresponding to the application-scoped resource exists and replacing the application-scoped resource in the aggregate view of the native resources. The Examiner cites Atm for the purpose of describing enumerating an aggregate view of native resources. However, Atm is directed to dynamic registry partitioning and is silent with regards to an isolation environment comprising a user isolation layer and an application isolation layer, much less determining that a user-scoped resource corresponding to an application-scoped resource exists and replacing the application-scoped resource in an aggregate view of the native resources. Therefore, Atm also fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, because the combination of Blaser and Atm fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-14, and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome and request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: July 16, 2010

/ John D. Lanza /
John D. Lanza
Reg. No. 40,060
Attorney for Applicants

Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: (617) 248-5000
Fax: (617) 502-5002